



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,142	06/14/2001	Paul M. Thomsen	HITHOME.001A	8108
20995	7590	11/16/2005	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			SHELEHEDA, JAMES R	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	
FOURTEENTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA 92614			2617	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/881,142	Applicant(s) THOMSEN, PAUL M.	
	Examiner James Sheleheda	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-20, 22-26, 28-31 and 33-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-20, 22-26, 28-31 and 33-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 5, 6, 33 and 35 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claims 5 and 6, line 1, "4" should be removed from the claim as claim four has been cancelled.

In claim 33, line 1, "claim 32" should be changed to --claim 31-- as claim 32 has been cancelled.

In claim 35, line 2, "the television display" should be changed to --the display-- to conform with applicant's amendment to the independent claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Amendment

2. The declaration filed on 10/31/05 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Wong et al. (6,748,375) reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Wong reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. An applicant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required. Gould v. Schawlow, 363 F.2d 908, 919, 150 USPQ 634, 643 (CCPA 1966) (Merely stating that there were no weeks or months that the invention was not worked on is not enough.); In re Harry, 333 F.2d 920, 923, 142 USPQ 164, 166 (CCPA 1964) (statement that the subject matter "was diligently reduced

Art Unit: 2617

to practice" is not a showing but a mere pleading). A 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal. In re Mulder, 716 F.2d 1542, 1545, 219 USPQ 189, 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (37 CFR 1.131 issue). As noted in the declaration, it is the inventor's statement that the invention was conceived prior to September 6, 2000 and constructively reduced to practice on December 1, 2001. There is no showing with respect to the continued diligence on the part of the inventor during the entire period to reduce the invention to practice between September 6th, 2000 and November 12, 2000 and further between November 28, 2000 and December 1, 2000. The statement that Mr. Thomsen submitted the proposal and amendment to Eric Nelson on November 12, 2000 is lacking of any showing as to positive actions throughout the entire period by the inventor, as a plurality of dates are completely unaccounted for.

With respect to statements regarding the diligence of the attorney in preparing and filing patent application inures, as set forth in MPEP 2138.06, six days to execute and file application is acceptable. Haskell v. Coleburne, 671 F.2d 1362, 213 USPQ 192, 195 (CCPA 1982). See also Bey v. Kollonitsch, 866 F.2d 1024, 231 USPQ 967 (Fed. Cir. 1986). If the attorney has a reasonable backlog of unrelated cases which he takes up in chronological order and carries out expeditiously, that is sufficient to provide reasonable diligence. Work on a related case(s) that contributed substantially to the ultimate preparation of an application can be credited as diligence. In this case, however, it is unclear if reasonable diligence has taken place as no specific explanation has been provided towards the extended period between November 12th, 2000 and December 1st, 2000.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In response to applicant's arguments in regards to the declaration, see (2) above.

b. On page 10, applicant argues that Chang fails to disclose "transmitting the selected symbols to a database system."

In response, as indicated in the previous action, Chang was never relied upon to disclose this feature as Chang was only relied upon to disclose allowing a user to highlight and select particular closed caption words to perform a search. It was Wong who was relied upon to disclose the specific feature of transmitting the closed caption words to an external database system (the Internet; see Wong at column 3, lines 45-55).

c. On page 10, applicant argues that the symbols in Wong are automatically generated, and that Wong does not disclose wherein the selected symbols were selected as a result of receiving instructions via the input device.

In response, as indicated in the previous action, it was Chang was relied upon to disclose the specific features of receiving instructions from an input device identifying a selected symbol (see Chang at column 5, lines 26-38), not

Wong. Wong was never relied upon to disclose this feature and was only relied upon to disclose the specific limitation of transmitting a closed caption word to an external database system.

d. In response to applicant's statement on page 10 that the references fail in combination to teach or suggest as least one limitation in claim 1, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In this case, Chang was relied upon to teach allowing a user to highlight and select closed caption words from the display. Wong was then relied upon to teach transmitting closed caption words to an external database. It is the combination of Wong with Chang which results in current claim limitations.

The mere fact that Chang and Wong individually do not teach all of the claim limitations does not negate a rejection based upon the *combination* of the two, as any requirement to have a single reference disclose each and every limitation would in fact eliminate the possibility of any and all 35 U.S.C. 103(a) obviousness rejections.

e. The Official Notice presented in the prior action stating that it is notoriously well known in the art to utilize a handheld remote control was not traversed and is accordingly taken as an admission of the fact noted.

f. The Official Notice presented in the prior action stating that it is notoriously well known in the art to utilize digital transmission signals was not traversed and is accordingly taken as an admission of the fact noted.

g. The Official Notice presented in the prior action stating that it is notoriously well known in the art to provide television signals which conform to the EIA/CEA-608-B and EIA-708-B standards was not traversed and is accordingly taken as an admission of the fact noted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-20, 22-26, 28-31 and 33-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (5,543,851) (of record) in view of Wong et al. (Wong) (5,748,375) (of record).

As to claim 1, while Chang discloses a method of selecting symbols on a display (Fig. 1), the method comprising:

receiving a video signal that comprises closed caption data (column 2, lines 32-36 and column 4, lines 40-50), wherein the closed caption data includes a plurality of symbols (including text data; column 4, lines 47-50 and Figs. 6-7);

displaying the closed caption data on the display (column 4, lines 47-50);

storing at least a portion of the closed caption data in a buffer (column 4, line 67-column 5, line 3);

receiving, via an input device (Fig. 3, input device, 58), first control instructions to maintain the displayed closed caption on the television display (caption pause command; column 5, lines 26-29) until the occurrence of a selected event, wherein the selected event is receipt of second control instructions to resume the display of the closed caption data in the video signal (column 5, lines 29-33);

receiving, via the input device, the third control instructions to select at least one of the symbols (column 5, lines 34-38); and

highlighting the selected symbols on the display (column 5, lines 34-38; Figs. 6a and 7), he fails to specifically disclose transmitting, via a network, the selected symbols to a database system that is external to the display.

In an analogous art, Wong discloses a television receiver (column 3, lines 26-44) wherein keywords are selected from the television closed captioning text (column 3, lines 26-48) and transmitted to a database system that is external to the display (external Internet search engine; column 3, lines 45-55), via a network (column 4, line

59-column 5, line 10) for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast (column 3, lines 45-55 and column 1, lines 61-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang's system to include transmitting, via a network, the selected symbols to a database system that is external to the display, as taught by Wong, for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast.

As to claim 3, while Chang discloses an electronic device (Fig. 1), comprising:
an input device (Fig. 3, input device, 58) for receiving control instructions from a user (column 4, lines 17-20);

a controller (microcontroller controlling the system; column 3, lines 42-53) for receiving and displaying a video signal that comprises closed caption data (column 2, lines 32-36 and column 4, lines 40-50), wherein the closed caption data includes a plurality of symbols (including text data; column 4, lines 47-50 and Figs. 6-7), wherein in response to receiving first control instructions from a user (caption pause command; column 5, lines 26-29), the controller maintains a selected portion of the closed caption data on the television display (column 5, lines 26-29) until the occurrence of a selected event, wherein the selected event is receipt of second control instructions to resume the display of the closed caption data in the video signal (column 5, lines 29-33), and wherein, in response to receiving, via the input device, the third control instructions to

select at least one of the symbols (column 5, lines 34-38), the controller highlights the selected symbols on the television display (column 5, lines 34-38; Figs. 6a and 7), he fails to specifically disclose wherein the controller is configured to transmit the selected symbols to a database system that is external to the electronic device.

In an analogous art, Wong discloses a television receiver (column 3, lines 26-44) wherein keywords are selected from the television closed captioning text (column 3, lines 26-48) and transmitted to a database system that is external to the device (external Internet search engine; column 3, lines 45-55), via a network (column 4, line 59-column 5, line 10) for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast (column 3, lines 45-55 and column 1, lines 61-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang's system to include wherein the controller is configured to transmit the selected symbols to a database system that is external to the electronic device, as taught by Wong, for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast.

As to claim 7, while Chang discloses a method of selecting symbols on a display (Fig. 1), the method comprising:

receiving a video signal that comprises data (column 2, lines 32-36 and column 4, lines 40-50), wherein the closed caption data includes a plurality of symbols (including text data; column 4, lines 47-50 and Figs. 6-7);

displaying one or more of the symbols (column 4, lines 47-50), wherein the displayed symbols are selectable on a symbol-by-symbol basis (wherein individual words may be selected; column 6, lines 24-29);

in response to a user request, maintaining one or more of the displayed symbols on the display (caption pause command; column 5, lines 26-29); and

in response to a user request, selecting one or more of the displayed symbols on the display (column 5, lines 34-38), he fails to specifically disclose transmitting, via a network, the selected symbols to a database system.

In an analogous art, Wong discloses a television receiver (column 3, lines 26-44) wherein keywords are selected from the television closed captioning text (column 3, lines 26-48) and transmitted to a database system (Internet search engine; column 3, lines 45-55), via a network (column 4, line 59-column 5, line 10) for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast (column 3, lines 45-55 and column 1, lines 61-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang's system to include transmitting, via a network, the selected symbols to a database system, as taught by Wong, for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast.

As to claim 20, while Chang discloses an electronic device (Fig. 1), comprising:

an interface (Fig. 3, input device, 58) for receiving control instructions from a user (column 4, lines 17-20);

a controller (microcontroller controlling the system; column 3, lines 42-53) for receiving and displaying a video signal that comprises data (column 2, lines 32-36 and column 4, lines 40-50), wherein the data includes a plurality of symbols (including text data; column 4, lines 47-50 and Figs. 6-7), wherein in response to receiving first control instructions from a user (caption pause command; column 5, lines 26-29), the controller maintains at least some of the symbols on the display (column 5, lines 26-29) and wherein the controller receives second control instructions to select one or more of the symbols on the display (column 5, lines 34-38), he fails to specifically disclose wherein the electronic device is configured to transmit the selected symbols to a database system that is external to the electronic device.

In an analogous art, Wong discloses a television receiver (column 3, lines 26-44) wherein keywords are selected from the television closed captioning text (column 3, lines 26-48) and transmitted to a database system that is external to the device (external Internet search engine; column 3, lines 45-55), via a network (column 4, line 59-column 5, line 10) for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast (column 3, lines 45-55 and column 1, lines 61-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang's system to include wherein the electronic device is configured to transmit the selected symbols to a database system that is

external to the electronic device, as taught by Wong, for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast.

As to claim 31, while Chang discloses a system for selecting symbols on a television display (Fig. 3), the system comprising:

means (tuner, 16) for receiving a video signal that comprises data (column 2, lines 32-36 and lines 48-58), wherein the data includes a plurality of symbols (including text data; column 4, lines 47-50 and Figs. 6-7);

means (TV, 24) for displaying the data (column 4, lines 47-50);

means (microcontroller), responsive to a user request (column 5, lines 25-29), for maintaining a selected portion of the data on the display (column 5, lines 25-29); and

means (microcontroller), responsive to a user request (column 5, lines 34-38), for selecting at least a portion of one of the symbols on the display (column 5, lines 34-38), he fails to specifically disclose means for transmitting the selected symbols to a database system that is external to the system.

In an analogous art, Wong discloses a television receiver (column 3, lines 26-44) wherein keywords are selected from the television closed captioning text (column 3, lines 26-48) and transmitted to a database system that is external to the device (external Internet search engine; column 3, lines 45-55), via a network (column 4, line 59-column 5, line 10) for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast (column 3, lines 45-55 and column 1, lines 61-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang's system to include means for transmitting the selected symbols to a database system that is external to the system, as taught by Wong, for the typical benefit of providing a user with immediate access to additional content related to the current broadcast.

As to claims 2 and 6, while Chang and Wong disclose the use of an input device (keyboard; see Chang at column 4, lines 17-20), he fails to specifically disclose wherein the input device is handheld.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize a handheld remote control to operate a television, such as a typical IR remote which may be carried and used anywhere in a room, for the typical benefit of providing a more convenient, flexible and mobile means for the user to operate the television system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang and Wong's system to include wherein the input device is handheld for the typical benefit of providing a more convenient, flexible and mobile means for the user to operate the television system.

As to claims 5, 8 and 22, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the database system is an Internet search engine (see Wong at column 3, lines 45-48).

As to claims 9, 23, Chang and Wong disclose searching the database system for information based at least in part upon the selected symbols (using the caption words as search terms; see Wong at column 3, lines 45-52); and automatically displaying the results of the search (see Wong at column 3, line 52-column 4, line 7).

As to claim 10, 25 and 34, Chang and Wong disclose transmitting the selected symbols over the Internet to a remote computer (transmitting the search terms to a computer running the search engine and then receiving the results; see Wong at column 3, lines 45-55).

As to claims 11 and 24, while Chang and Wong disclose receiving a video signal, they fail to specifically disclose wherein the signal is digital.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize digital transmission signals to transmit television video and other data, which require less bandwidth and storage space as analog signals, for the typical benefit of providing a more efficient transmission system which would require less bandwidth and storage for the video signals.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang and Wong's system to include wherein the video

signal is digital for the typical benefit of providing a more efficient transmission system which would require less bandwidth and storage for the video signals.

As to claim 12, Chang and Wong disclose highlighting the selected symbols on the display (see Chang at column 5, lines 34-38; Figs. 6a and 7).

As to claims 13 and 36, Chang and Wong disclose transmitting the selected symbols to an external device (transmitting the search terms to a computer running the search engine and then receiving the results; see Wong at column 3, lines 45-55).

As to claims 14 and 37, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the external device is an information retrieval system (Internet search engine; see Wong at column 3, lines 45-55).

As to claim 15, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the controller stores at least a portion of the received video signal in a buffer (see Chang at column 4, line 67-column 5, line 3).

As to claims 16 and 17, while Chang and Wong disclose a video signal containing closed captioning (see Chang at column 2, lines 30-36), they fail to specifically disclose wherein the video signal is in accordance with the EIA/CEA-608-B or EIA-708-B standard.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to provide television signals which conform to the EIA/CEA-608-B and EIA-708-B standards, which define the proper means for providing closed captioning in a digital or NTSC video signal, for the typical benefit of providing a television transmission system which conforms to established and widely used closed captioning standards.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang and Wong's system to include wherein the video signal is in accordance with the EIA/CEA-608-B or EIA-708-B standard for the typical benefit of providing a television transmission system which conforms to established and widely used closed captioning standards.

As to claim 18, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the user initiates the request to select the symbols by identifying a location on the display (see Chang at column 6, lines 24-29).

As to claim 19, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the symbols are selected by determining which of the words in the video signal is displayed at the identified location (identifying the selected word and performing a function; see Chang at column 6, lines 24-48).

As to claim 26, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the television highlights the selected symbols on a display (see Chang at column 5, lines 34-38; Figs. 6a and 7).

As to claim 28, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the controller stores at least a portion of the received video signal in a buffer (see Chang at column 4, line 67-column 5, line 3).

As to claim 29, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the user initiates the request to select the symbols by identifying a location on the television display (see Chang at column 6, lines 24-29).

As to claim 30, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the symbols are selected by determining which symbols are displayed at the identified location (identifying the selected word and performing a function; see Chang at column 6, lines 24-48).

As to claim 33, Chang and Wong disclose
means for searching the database system (see Wong at column 3, lines 45-52),
wherein the selected symbols are used as keywords of the search (using the caption words as search terms; see Wong at column 3, lines 45-52); and

means for automatically displaying the results of the search (see Wong at column 3, line 52-column 4, line 7).

As to claim 35, Chang and Wong disclose means for highlighting the selected symbols on the display (see Chang at column 5, lines 34-38; Figs. 6a and 7).

As to claim 38, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the controller stores at least a portion of the received video signal in a buffer (see Chang at column 4, line 67-column 5, line 3).

As to claim 39, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the user initiates the request to select the symbols by identifying a location on the display (see Chang at column 6, lines 24-29).

As to claim 40, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the symbols are selected by determining which of the words in the video signal is displayed at the identified location (identifying the selected word and performing a function; see Chang at column 6, lines 24-48).

As to claims 41 and 42, while Chang and Wong disclose a network, they fail to specifically disclose wherein the network is wireless.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize wireless networking, which eliminates the need for a wire physical connection and other infrastructure, for the typical benefit of

allowing providing a more flexible, user friendly network which eliminates the need for users to physically connect through wires and other static infrastructure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Chang and Wong's system to include a wireless network for the typical benefit of allowing providing a more flexible, user friendly network which eliminates the need for users to physically connect through wires and other static infrastructure.

As to claims 43 and 44, Chang and Wong disclose wherein the device further comprises a television (TV, 24; see Chang at Fig. 1).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2617

7. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. () _____ - _____ on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sheleheda whose telephone number is (571) 272-7357. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James Sheleheda
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617

JS


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600